New York Tribune

First to Last—the Truth: News—Editorials—Advertisements

Member of the Audit Bureau of Circulations.

FRIDAY, MARCH 4, 1921

Owned by New York Tribune Inc., a New York Corporation. Published daily. Ogden Reid, President; G. Vernor Rogers, Vice-President; Helen Rogers Reid, Secretary; R. E. Maxfield, Treasurer. Address, Tribune Building, 154 Nassau Street, New York. Telephone, Beekman 3000.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—By mail, including Postage, IN THE UNITED STATES.

By Mail, Postpaid.	One Year.	Six Months.	One Month.
Daily and Sunday	$12.00	$6.00	$1.00
One week, 35c.			
Daily only	10.00	5.00	.85
One week, 20c.			
Sunday only	4.00	2.25	.40
Sunday only, Canada	6.00	3.25	.55
FOREIGN RATES			
Daily and Sunday	$26.00	$13.50	$2.40
Daily only	17.40	8.70	1.45
Sunday only	9.76	5.12	.80

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.

GUARANTY

You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for if dissatisfaction results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape. No quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

MEMBER OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

The Associated Press is exclusively entitled to the use for republication of all news dispatches credited to it or not otherwise credited in this paper, and also the local news of spontaneous origin published herein.

Inauguration Day

Without pomp or circumstance, with a simplicity befitting the ceremonials of a republic, Warren Gamaliel Harding, citizen, will to-day take the oath of office as the twenty-eighth President of the United States. He will swear, to the best of his ability, to "preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States."

No President ever came to office with greater good will toward him among his fellow citizens. They believe in his sincere desire to serve the country. The outflowing of sympathy to him, except with a negligible minority, is universal. In view of this it is no ill thing that he is not the custodian and champion of any minutely defined contentious policy, and hence that he has great liberty of action.

The multiplicity and complexity of his tasks arouse compassion. His problems do not press on him singly, but in battalions. On him, in the last instance, rests a momentous leadership. And as he is too honest and modest to claim to be a miracle worker, and too sound in character to turn to quackery and demagogy, no wonder his face is grave and his demeanor serious.

But though his burdens are heavy, their very weight holds out to him the best promise of assistance. Narrow and restricted is the person whose heart does not go out to him; mean and pitiful the soul not led to resolve to avoid haste and uncharity of judgment. The friendship of a great people sustains him, and in his closet we may be sure he will reverently seek the guidance which Lincoln solicited and obtained.

The unsolved international problem left on his doorstep insistently calls for immediate attention. The war's objects have not yet been attained. Mankind's calamities are the consequence of conditions which still exist. There is yet no adequate assurance against the recurrence of another horror.

As Lincoln said a divided house could not stand, that slavery must be put in process of extinction or of triumph, so it must be decided what forces are to control the future—might, with blood as its argument, or power linked with righteousness.

A great power, a prey to the lust of domination, having appeared amid a community of nations ill prepared for defense, the pacific peoples barely escaped conquest. To secure durable peace it became necessary for the aggressive spirit to fall into disrepute among the peoples who were victims of it, or, failing that, to have a concert of the pacific peoples to guard against future attacks.

Alas! neither end has been reached—the aggressors of 1914, with Russia added to their company, have no regrets, and wait for an opportunity to strike again, while discord has been lamentably introduced among the nations whose harmony is essential to peace.

The first great work of the new Administration is to leave nothing undone to restore the spirit of the alliance of 1918. What machinery is set up does not much matter—the less of it, probably, the better. But we must be friends with our friends. Let us not be ashamed to declare that our self-interest, as well as our interest in the world's welfare, requires us to draw near again to Great Britain, France, Italy, Belgium and all others who joined loyally on our side in the great military struggle.

Looking within the country, the new Administration may properly adopt as its motto the letter of the oath to-day taken by its chief. To preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States—this is enough. All great duties are implicit in the oath. The Constitution distributes governmental powers; it recognizes no class distinction; its purpose is to secure liberty under law—not any new-fangled kind of liberty, but the old-fashioned kind which the men of Concord, of Valley Forge and Yorktown believed in. Keep this a living flame in the hearts of our magistrates and our people, and common sense can be relied on to settle domestic issues.

The day is one of hope and of thanksgiving. It opens up many agreeable vistas. Lifted up to the world's most powerful place and generously supported by a people who can say without boasting that so far they have shown some capacity for intelligent self-government, and that the world is none the worse because of the American example, we listen with great confidence for the first signal of the new captain's bell.

The German Way

The Germans, fortunately for the rest of the world, are blundering diplomatists. They may understand their own psycholcgy. But they are lost when they try to grasp the psychology of other nations. In the German attitude toward alien peoples there is no happy mean between cringing and bluster. And the German manner is fatally maladroit, whether it is intended to be lamblike or lionlike.

Lloyd George said at Birmingham some weeks ago that Minister Simons had won his respect at Spa. The British delegates, at least, thought him intelligent and honest. There was a chance for him to strengthen the good impression at London and to lay the foundation for a workable reparations understanding with the Allies. He appeared to have with him a considerable body of English opinion, the opinion voiced conspicuously by Keynes and the Liberal and Labor press, which, for commercial and other reasons, favored a "soft" peace and speedy economic restoration in Germany.

But Minister Simons and the government for which he spoke completely misjudged the situation at London. They couldn't comprehend the value of a further show of good faith and moderation. They overestimated their successes at Spa and rashly figured on submitting an ultimatum, instead of accepting one, with some minor abatements. The Simons proposal not only disgusted the Allied plenipotentiaries, but it sent all the Keynesites and "soft" peace sympathizers scurrying to cover. Hardly a voice has been raised in England in behalf of an offer which corresponds pretty closely to the reparations total which Keynes and his followers were not long ago describing as fair and reasonable. Some American mild reparationists are apologetically explaining that "Germany has offered terms near enough to Allied demands to permit discussion and adjustment." But at the same time they are filled with dismay at Simons's inept and irritating methods.

Germany has, in fact, again reunited the Allies. Out of direct contact with her spokesmen, the Allied leaders have often wavered and divided. But whenever the German attitude toward the peace has had a chance to reveal itself in all its contemptuous obstinacy Allied dissensions have been obscured. It is the German way, the same old German way. The Germans were unfortunately banned from the peace table at Paris. It is clear that we could have had a better peace if they had been there to keep the Allies always alive to the necessity of unity.

Home Folks

The alien visitor and the native cynic might read sentimentality into the emotional farewells spoken at Marion between a new President of the Republic and his home folks. But no American with any first-hand knowledge of his country and an eye for reality would make such a blunder. Home folks are about the realest thing we have in America. The emotions which they feel and which they bestir are deep and genuine and utterly free from sentimentality or any taint of pretense.

That last day at Marion springs from an old American habit and tradition of heart and mind. For better, for worse, an American is an intensely local animal; for better, as our forefathers considered, for they did everything they could—consistent with forming "a more perfect union"—to shape our governmental system so as to foster local interest and maintain alive and vigorous the bonds of the lesser groups, our states, our counties, our villages, our crossroads. It is only by a comprehension of this strong sense of local pride, of small community friendships, that the American statesman, or any American leader, great or small, can be fully understood.

In Congress this intense localism has worked evil at times. To the contrary, we think the record shows that its influence upon the Chief Executive has always been sound and good. There is little danger of a President's thinking too largely of his own locality. His horizon is too wide; his obligations to the whole nation are too vast and insistent. But he can take much spiritual sustenance from his home town—and in most cases has been thus upheld and sustained. The departures from Springfield, Ill., from the old friends there, are vivid chapters in the Lincoln biography. The scenes at Marion but parallel episodes in the lives of most of our Presidents.

We would suggest that Main Street has a constructive power—as well as a limiting power. The narrowness, the meannesses of small-town life are obvious. Not so superficial, indeed so fundamental and hidden that our younger novelists are in danger of losing sight of them altogether, are the trust and faith and pride which a small town feels in its outstanding men and women. It is a fierce light that beats on the dweller among such home folks—but a warm one. To say that these old memories and bonds, of boyhood and schooldays, the beginnings of business and the climb up the ladder, are built into the character of every man and form part of his inmost heart and soul, is to state what every psychologist knows and what every one of us has realized at moments of tragedy or exaltation or grave decision. Here are bonds truly indestructible, and it is literal truth to say that in this fashion the home folks of Marion will have more to do with influencing and guiding the coming administration than any other group of Americans.

Perhaps the home town influence does not make directly for breadth of vision or for soaring imagination. But it does make for character in the broadest sense of that term—for strength of will, for generous ambition, for a resolve to spend and be spent in that cause of us all which we term America. We can all be thankful that our land is built upon this foundation of home folks and that once again the hero of such sustaining loyalty and friendship takes first place among us.

Daylight Saving All the Same

The state daylight saving law was sacrificed to the complaints of a minority. These complaints, so far as they had any substance, came from a very small body of farmers, those engaged in truck gardening and producing and marketing milk. But in the rural districts there was an undeniable general prejudice against daylight saving as an invasion of long-established habits.

The country population has a smaller stake in daylight saving than the urban population has. Country people, at least, feel that its benefits are nearly negligible. But in the cities and towns the turning back of the clock's hands represents a material saving in gas and electric light bills, more leisure for outdoor enjoyment and a betterment of public health. Dr. Copeland has recently emphasized the value of the extra daylight hour as a sanitary factor. Even were it not an additional aid in fighting unsanitary conditions, its other advantages are beyond challenge and are now clearly established in the minds of city dwellers and suburbanites.

These classes form a majority of the state's population, although they haven't yet a majority voice at Albany. The repeal bill disregards majority interests, but it leaves the urbanites free to enjoy local daylight saving. New York City will certainly exercise that option. The inconveniences of a conflict between a local standard and a state standard are slight. People living in New Jersey last year and working in New York easily adjusted themselves to the difference in clock time. We already have a local time saving ordinance, effective this year. It would be advisable, however, to shorten the period a little, making the change in April, instead of March, and going back to standard time the last Sunday in September, instead of the last Sunday in October.

Daylight saving is a laudable effort to improve living conditions. No big urban community can afford to disregard its benefits.

Lenine's Bloody Sunday

Latest reports from the meager sources of information available indicate that the Bolsheviki have succeeded in crushing the uprisings of workingmen in Petrograd. Despite the official Bolshevist denials of the revolutionary uprising against the bloody tyranny of Lenine and Trotzky, there is every reason to believe that the workers and general population of the former Russian capital, driven to desperation by unheard of political and militarist oppression and economic privations, decided to take matters into their own hands and went out into the streets carrying arms to bring about the overthrow of their oppressors.

Lenine, Trotzky, Zinovieff and the smaller satraps of the Communist dictatorship, assisted by their American lackeys and publicity agents, may either seek to deny the uprisngs of the Russian working people or place the blame for them upon "counter revolutionary" Social Revolutionists and Mensheviki and "agents of the Entente." The fact remains, however, that the bonds that have united the Russian working people with the Bolsheviki have long ago been severed by the deception, treachery, corruption and moral and political perversion of the votaries of commissaro-autocracy and knout-communism.

The Russian working people and the people of Russia in general hate and detest their present tyrants with a hatred and detestation exceeding their bitterness and opposition against the defunct régime of the Romanoffs. What happened in Petrograd was a repetition of Bloody Sunday of Romanoff days, that fatal event when the protests and appeals of the Russian people carried to the Winter Palace were drowned in blood by the Cossacks and gendarmerie of Trepoff and Von Plehve. Trepoff and Von Plehve won, just as the Djersinskys and Latzisis of Bolshevist absolutism seem to have won the battle just fought in Petrograd. The ochrana of Nicholas II carried the day as did the spies of the Extraordinary Commission. But who is there so blind as not to see that just as Bloody Sunday of 1905 marked the death knell of the Czarist autocracy and sealed forever the fate of the decayed and putrefied monarchist régime, so will the victory of Lenine's executioners in Petrograd mark the beginning of the end of the most loathsome political rule in the history of man? Lenine has had his Bloody Sunday. The Ninth of Thermidor is close at hand.

"It Are Me"

Whatever diapason of horror is wrenched from Oxford and Cambridge by the Chicago ukase legitimatizing "It is me" and "He don't," the ancient monitors of purest English have endured for centuries the use of plural subjects and singular verbs by some of the greatest figures in literature.

In the authorized and revised versions of the Bible appear: "And now *abideth* faith, hope, charity, these three;" "Where moth and rust *doth* corrupt;" "To comprehend what *is* the breadth, and length, and depth, and height;" "Out of the same mouth *proceedeth* blessing and cursing."

Shakespeare wrote: "Wherein *doth* sit the fear and dread of kings." —Merchant of Venice, IV, 1. Also, "Hostility and civil tumult *reigns*." —King John, IV, 2.

Milton: "Both death and I *am* found eternal."

Byron: "To rive what God and Turk and Time *hath* spared."

Kipling: "The tumult and the shouting *dies*."

Had all these writers, and many others, a grammatical blind-spot on their brains? asks John o' London's Weekly, in its current number. This astute weekly contributes to "an old and recurring discussion" with the following:

> "Were they—these masters of expression—united by a common search after something in the alchemy of language above rules of grammar? I (John o' London) think they were. I think they used a singular verb with a plural nominative for a purpose, and that the reader who has taste and perception can see their aim and approve the means. I suggest that the following proposition might be used as a kind of touchstone: *The singular verb is more intense than the plural verb.* . . . 'Thine *is* the kingdom, and the power, and the glory.' Here *is* is superior to *are* because it suggests by anticipation the attribution of a single thing—the all—not merely the things that are about to be named. To say, 'Thine *are* the kingdom, the power, and the glory' is less comprehensive: it savors of enumeration. Enumeration suggests the ability to enumerate and the right to withhold. It is a weaker ascription."

Very interesting, and no doubt correct. It is not necessary to blush when approving or disapproving an English precedent in our common English language. Our racial control over it is quite as strong as theirs, possibly stronger, since we are greater in numbers and more—well, peripatetic. In the end we shall probably do far more to guide the development of the language than they. Certainly this land has not permitted the old tongue to go wandering in corrupt pastures as have the provinces of England, where dialects of shires have so hardened, due to an avoidance of itinerancy, that neighboring county folk sometimes find it difficult to understand one another.

At any rate, innovating Chicago may claim that so far it has not strayed from orthodoxy.

Gas Prices and Dividends

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: In your editorial of March 2 on "Boosting Gas Prices" there is a very significant statement. It is to the effect that in the report of the gas company no evidence is shown as to whether or not the operation is efficient. One of the major defects of all our public service regulation laws is the lack of any incentive to efficiency. A fixed return on capital investment invites padded pay rolls when costs are decreasing and appeals for relief when costs are increasing.

Why not, therefore, make the dividend rate vary inversely as the price charged for the service? For example, if the company gives us 75 cent gas, permit it to pay 10 per cent dividends; gas at 80 cents, 8 per cent; gas at $1, 4 per cent; and no dividends when the $1.25 mark is reached. Under such an arrangement the gas company would soon find a way to buy cheaper oil. W. R. BRYANS.

New York, March 2, 1921.

"Hans and His Colleen"

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Permit me to express my appreciation of the editorial in this morning's issue, "Hans and His Colleen."

It well expresses the sentiments of that large body of unfortunates who are not hyphenated Americans and who, consequently, are quickly suppressed if they give voice to purely American patriotism.

CHARLES D. SINCLAIR.

New York, March 2, 1921.

An Official Joke

(From The Cincinnati Enquirer)

You can't make the tired business man, suffering from brainstorm trying to figure out his income taxes, believe the government didn't employ Professor Einstein to design the income tax blanks.

The Conning Tower

THE REVENANT

The bluebirds paused upon their southward way,
To feast upon late berries through the day—
The birds that brought the ancient red man cheer
Because they made him sure that spring was near.
With coming dusk, a gentle rain began,
Light, warm and soothing; from the eves it ran
As in that Chopin Prelude; no wind blew.
And, as I harkened to the rain, I knew
The birds told truth; for Spring last night once more
Strayed lonely o'er the hills she loved of yore,
Mourning her lost green joy. Behold, a tear
Clings where she passed along the garden—here,
On a poor bud that wakens not, nor knows
How fair a thing it is to be a rose.

G. S. B.

It might almost be Dulcinea her sweet self speaking. It is Mr. Charles Swem, President, at the moment of going to press, Wilson's stenographer. "His shyness is mistaken for aloofness." Things have come to such a Freudian pass nowadays that all a man needs to do to get a reputation for shyness is to appear to be in Betelguese; and the way to acquire a name for excessive modesty is to be bold and impudent. Skim milk may have masqueraded as Grade A cream in Gilbert's time; but it is astonishing these days how frequently things are not what they seem.

Hymns of Hate

A girl I hate
Is Anna Root;
She always says,
"I'm ready: Shoot!"

Among the five things we do not understand is the dual literary personality of Miss Clare Kummer. Miss Kummer's prose has a feathery, mischievous poeticalness; her poetry, to our notion, is the utterest prose, comparable only to the kind of words that go with so many of Mr. Jerome D. Kern's songs, such as "And I'm certainly going to tell them." The songs in "Chinese Love" and "The Choir Rehearsal," up at the Punch and Judy, are no advancement on Miss Kummer's "Dearie," the high poetic point being "A wonderful thing has come into my life."

JOURNALISTIC JINGLES

5. Book Reviewer's Pantoum

"This novel is perfectly ripping."
"His couplets remind us of Pope."
"How lurid these tales are, and gripping!"
"The book is complete in its scope."

"His couplets remind us of Pope."
"This poet some day will bear watching."
"The book is complete in its scope."
"Good Lord, what a terrible botching!"

"This poet will some day bear watching."
"He deals with the problem of sex."
"Good Lord, what a terrible botching!"
"The plot is unique and complex."

"He deals with the problem of sex."
"How lurid these tales are, and gripping!"
"The plot is unique and complex."
"This novel is perfectly ripping!"

CHICOT.

"Allies Give Germany Ultimatum," was one of yesterday's Evemail headlines. Giving Germany an ultimatum is bringing coal to Wilkes-Barre. An ultimatum is no treat to Germany. Probably there is a notice in the Berliner Tageblatt that unless the Allies call for a gross of assorted ultimata in five days, they will be sold to pay storage charges.

Mother Goose: By Sylrania

The south wind doth blow,
And melteth the snow,
And what will the tractor do then, poor thing?
'Twill work on the farm,
While summer is warm,
Then back to the city till spring, poor thing!

* * *

The little old Boss and I fell out,
I'll tell you what it was all about;
He had some space and I had none,
And that's the way the row begun.

Between her toes and her dimple Miss Englar is very attractive.—Ann Arbor, Mich., Times News.

A blanket indorsement, if we ever saw one.

The Mad Pursuit of Pleasure

[From the Hempstead Sentinel]

Of the many joyful and pleasant affairs recently held at the Hansen residence, Hempstead Gardens, the best ever took place on Washington's Birthday evening. From beginning to end every minute was utilized in the manufacture and exhibition of amusement. Singing and dancing, even operatic and exhibitional, were greatly enjoyed. Games were delightfully played. Jokes, both original and repetitions, and expressions, both comical and tragical, received tremendous applause. Laughter, even cachinnation, flourished exuberantly throughout the evening. The refreshments were unsurpassable for daintiness and tastefulness.

Miss Beckett presented a stunning appearance as she sat at the counsel table beside her attorney, Herbert C. Smythe, modishly attired in a black satin gown.—The Journal.

"The Well Dressed Man."

Well, the celebrated chorus of "The Study Hour," the first watch-winning poem in this Campanile of Cacophony, written by Flaccus and Baron Ireland, will have to be revised now, somewhat as follows:

George Washington was the father of his country,
Which now has become a very famous nation;
Abraham Lincoln was quite celebrated—
He wrote the Emancipation Proclamation.
Alexander Hamilton wrote The Federalist,
A paper which tried to do the country's guarding;
This country has had nine-and-twenty Presidents
And the present one is Warren Gamaliel Harding.

F. P. A.

GOOD LUCK, OLD MAN, AND MAY NOTHING MAR YOUR STAY

Our Naval Program

By Quarterdeck

There has never been a time in the history of this country when sanity and common sense were so imperatively demanded in outlining our naval policy. Naval construction is in a state of flux; lessons of the World War have not yet been fully digested; aviation is developing by leaps and bounds, and invention promises so many innovations affecting naval warfare that a calm and searching investigation alone will prevent a possible blunder in our building plans—a blunder that might cost us hundreds of millions, with a weak navy as the unfortunate result.

The 1916 Program

The 1916 program is necessarily a pre-war conception. It is primarily designed to give us a 1916 navy. It could not be otherwise. To be fair, however, we will admit that the battleships and battle-cruisers as now designed are superior to any ships that took part in the Battle of Jutland, and it is possible that the most serious weaknesses in the capital ship as developed in the World War have been in some measure corrected. Nevertheless, the program as presented to Congress did not take intelligent account of the war record of the submarine, nor did it anticipate the part that aviation, torpedo planes, bombs, torpedoes and mines are to play in future war. If the Navy Department and the General Board had themselves studied and considered these vital matters, there is nothing in the program as originally presented to Congress that indicates any purpose but a determination to rush the 1916 program through "without reservations." Congress was not informed of the improvement in weapons that seriously menace the surface ship. It was not until the department was specially asked by Congress to report concerning these matters that the General Board presented a supplementary statement in which it admitted that the submarine "came very near winning the World War," that aviation was of importance and that airplane carriers should be provided. And it was emphasized, in this post-mortem and half-hearted acknowledgment of the value of submarines and aviation, that they were "hopes" rather than "accomplishments," and that the program must go through unrevised; if modern weapons were to be provided it must be by an additional appropriation. In short, it may be said that the 1916 program provides a fleet five years old. It does not provide a 1922 navy. It does not necessarily provide a strong navy. In ignoring modern weapons it may give us a weak navy.

Submarines

The governing details as to the work of submarines in the World War were not made known to the Naval Committees by the Navy Department. The following facts were presented by other authorities:

1. That the overwhelmingly powerful Grand Fleet, reinforced by the navies of France, Italy and Japan, did not control the sea in 1916 and 1917.

2. That the German submarines, manned by 10,000 men, nearly won the war against the navies of the world manned by 1,000,000 men—as the General Board admits!

3. That thirty submarines, employed daily, and manned by only 1,500 men, kept 5,000 small craft patrolling the sea and nearly starved England.

Notwithstanding this awful record, the General Board contented itself by saying that the submarine was finally conquered, and so it advocated the abandonment of seven new submarines to provide money for aviation! This suggestion is the more amazing at a time when our submarine fleet is totally inadequate, with not one long-range submarine fit to accompany the fleet!

Naval Secrets

The Navy Department not only withheld from Congress and failed to consider in its building program the demonstrated facts concerning the submarine in the World War, but it held back information of vital importance concerning certain actual tests and accomplishments with bombing and torpedo planes that should be seriously considered in connection with naval building, as follows:

1. Effect of 900 pounds of TNT exploded on the deck of the Indiana. This explosion penetrated three decks! It blew the topsides off the ship! It would have destroyed the fire control and electric light systems, leaving the battery unmanageable and the ship in darkness below decks. This one bomb would have rendered the ship useless in an engagement.

2. Experiments in bombing from a height of 4,000 to 6,000 feet in which 10 per cent of direct hits were made in the old Indiana, and 30 per cent of hits within a space equal to that of the deck of the new Indiana.

3. An actual experiment in England, where eight torpedo planes flew thirty-five miles over the land behind a smoke screen, attacked a British squadron at anchor and scored six hits, two of which were in the admiral's flagship! The planes returned in safety.

These and other facts were withheld by the Navy Department. Members of the General Board and bureau chiefs declared that these were "secrets" which should not have been divulged, and they considered them inconclusive. One bureau chief declared that the effect of the bomb on the Indiana was only "local"! An admiral, commenting on this amazing statement, pointed out that when a man is shot through the head the effect is "local." He is not torn limb from limb, to be sure. His "backbone" may remain! But there will be comparatively little fight left in him! The same would have been the case with the Indiana.

And another bureau chief declared as a condemnation of the bomb that the protective deck of the Indiana was not penetrated and that the bomb did not sink her! True. It was not necessary to sink her to make her useless! An enemy battleship in such a condition can be, humanely, permitted to float! She will be quite harmless. When we blow the top of a man's head off it is not necessary to bury him in order to kill him!

Now it is admitted that the decks of our new battleships and battle-cruisers are stronger than those of the Indiana. But even so, it must be plain to any naval officer that such an explosion, even if it did not penetrate the deck, would wreck everything above decks, knock down smoke pipes and masts, destroy fire control and communication systems, and the shock, particularly if combined with poison gas, would doubtless play havoc with the personnel.

Battleship Mania

Reviewing briefly the whole subject of the building program as now being discussed in Congress, it would appear that the Navy Department, many naval officers and even Washington society are suffering from acute battleship-itis! They see nothing but battleships, think of nothing but battleships, dream of nothing but battleships! To be sure, they may occasionally murmur, very weakly, something that would indicate a faint realization that certain modern weapons may be of use in the dim distant future! But they quickly relapse into the one-idea condition of mind and dream only of "backbones" and battleships.

There is no need of alarm on the part of battleship advocates. Nobody has proposed to scrap battleships. Nobody has denied the soundness, for the present, of the battleship-backbone theory. It has not even been suggested permanently to condemn any feature of the 1916 program. The most that has been suggested is temporarily to suspend construction on some ships that are only from 1 to 20 per cent completed until we can investigate, experiment and intelligently determine whether these ships shall be completed as designed or be transformed into airplane carriers, for instance. In the meantime the importance of submarines and aviation may be proved. In that event we can provide our surface fleet with the modern forces above and below the surface without which battleships cannot exist.

"Amendments Needed"

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Your editorial in this morning's paper entitled "Amendments Needed" should be carefully read from beginning to end by the Governor, every resident of New York City and all upstate legislators. A problem recognized is already half solved.

Unfortunately, the Governor appears to regard his commission bill as sacred. Is it to be the Republican "league" to drag us down to defeat?

Isn't is possible that it may be improved upon, for instance, as suggested by President Curran, or is the Republican party in this state headed by another "Professor Wilson" who will insist upon his treaty as issued?

The Governor has said "that public opinion is a curious thing. Ultimately it is pretty certain to be right." Then why was it necessary for him to say, "Those who oppose this solution are now what they have been for three years, mere obstructionists"?

Our Board of Estimate may not always have been wise, but is that any reason for the city to be slapped on the wrist like a naughty child and told that it is incapable of a republican form of government? Aren't we to have anything to say as to our tax money, our streets, or our own future welfare and development?

ROBERT S. ALLYN.

New York, March 3, 1921.

Armies of the Isthmus

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: In your editorial on "'Near War' on the Isthmus" you make the astounding statement that "Panama has no army."

This is surely an error.

I was at the Isthmus in 1890 and saw a review of their military forces. It is true, the regiments consisted of only seven ragged soldiers, barefoot and wearing only linen trousers and shirts; but they sported real guns.

Had it not been a Carib civilization I should have thought I was attending comic opera.

Possibly the Costa Rican army goes them one better in the possession of a brigadier general and a mule and a total force of nine, but it is excessively cruel of you to intimate that they are without that blessing of modern civilization—a real standing army!

WILLIAM DAVIDSON.

New York, March 2, 1921.